REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are now in this application. Claims 1, 11 and 19 have been amended and new claims 24-26 have been added as set forth above.

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,748,429 (Talluri et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,246,409 (Veghte et al.) The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on at least the remarks previously submitted in this application and further in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has relied upon the Talluri et al. patent to disclose a method for reporting topology changes in a subnet of a switched fabric including at least a client, a subnet manager (SM) and switches interconnected via links, including creating and reporting a list of topology changes that are interesting to the client for topology change notifications. The Examiner has indicated that Talluri et al. fails to teach when a topology change occurs in the subnet, determining if the topology change is in the list of topology changes created by the interested client; and if the topology change is in the list of topology changes created by the interested client, reporting a topology change event to the interested client. The Examiner has relied on Veghte et al. to disclose determining a list of network resources (and added network resources) that are interesting to the user and reporting the network resource changes to the user. The

Examiner has asserted that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Talluri et al. and Veghte et al. for the purpose of aggregating the list of network topology changes according to the user's interest and notifying the user of such modifications made within the network; because it would provide a constant update mechanism for reporting the status of the network's topology and available resources to clients of the network.

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth previously. For example, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in any possible combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of when a topology change occurs in a subnet, determining if the topology change is in the list of topology changes created by the interested client; and if the topology change is in the list of topology changes created by the interested client, reporting a topology change event to the interested client. The Examiner has admitted that these features are not taught in the Talluri et al. patent. Additionally, the Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not disclosed in or suggested by the Veghte et al. patent. The Veghte et al. patent does not even disclose or suggest any determining of topology changes or any reporting of topology changes. The Applicants respectfully submit that network resource changes are different than topology changes. For example, Veghte et al. discloses a display of network resources such as a computer 44, a printer 46, a folder 48, or a file 50 has been added to a Network Neighborhood.

According to the present invention as claimed, however, the claimed list of topology changes includes but is not limited to creation of a new data path in a switched fabric and destruction of an existing data path in a switched fabric. The Examiner has relied upon Col. 4, line 54 through Col. 5, line 20 of Veghte et al. to disclose that a list of topology changes includes, but is not limited to, when a new data path is created in a subnet of a switched fabric, when an existing data path is destroyed in a subnet of a switched fabric, when a new device is inserted into a subnet of a switched fabric, and when an existing device is removed from a subnet of a switched fabric. However, this section of the Veghte et al. patent does not disclose or suggest at least creation of a new data path in a switched fabric and destruction of an existing data path in the switched fabric. Col. 4, line 54 through Col. 5, line 20 of Veghte et al. discusses how a Network Neighborhood displays a visual representation (an icon) of computers, printers, folders, and files. Veghte et al. does not disclose any display of creation of a new data path in a switched fabric and also does not disclose any display of destruction of an existing data path in a switched fabric. Therefore, for all the above reasons, and for the reasons submitted previously in this application, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejections relied upon by the Examiner for at least the reasons set forth above and for the previously submitted reasons. In view of the foregoing, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Early notification of the same is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

July 21, 2006
Date

Robert D. Anderson
Reg. No. 33,826
(815) 885 - 2389

Intel Americas, Inc.